

# **Survey of Washington State Local Agencies on Meeting Minimum Sign Retroreflectivity Levels**

**Conducted by Washington State Department of Transportation**

**Highways and Local Programs Division**

**November 2012**

## **Background Information:**

In spring 2008, winter 2009/2010, and winter 2010/2011 local agencies were invited to answer a survey on meeting minimum traffic sign retroreflectivity levels. Survey questions ranged from "Has your agency estimated the cost for meeting compliance requirements? What are the costs?" to "What funding sources will your agency pursue to meet the new requirements?" Some agencies were not yet sure how they would proceed. The survey results are available on Washington State Department of Transportation's retroreflectivity web site at: <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/LocalPrograms/Traffic/SignRetro.htm>.

The goal of this follow up survey is to glance at how agencies are/are not currently using an assessment or management method to ensure that signs meet the minimum retroreflectivity levels in Table 2A-3 of the 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The goal is also to determine what it would take for those agencies without a method in place to implement a method by the June 13, 2014 target compliance date in 2009 MUTCD revision 2. A further goal is to know what resources agencies use for training, and what training needs agencies have. We believe that the findings from this survey will benefit all local agencies in Washington.

## **Target Compliance Dates:**

Effective June 13, 2012 with revision 2 of the 2009 MUTCD, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) modified the January 22, 2012 target compliance date to implement and then continue to use an assessment or management method to ensure that regulatory and warning signs meet minimum retroreflectivity levels. Agencies now have until June 13, 2014 to have an assessment or management method in place. Types of signs other than

regulatory and warning are to be added to an agency's management or assessment method as resources allow. Revision 2 also removed the target compliance dates by which signs needed to meet minimum retroreflectivity levels.

This change does not eliminate the requirements for maintaining sign retroreflectivity, but gives an agency flexibility to replace signs based on priority and resources. The agency needs to be prepared to defend its replacement scheduling decisions if liability issues arise.

## Survey Summary:

Highways and Local Programs received 42 responses to this year's survey in contrast to the 71 responses we received 2 years ago. We received responses from 29 cities and 13 counties. We had a good cross section of respondents from around the state with city populations ranging from 1,500 or less to 85,000 or more. The county populations ranged from 1,500 to 85,000 or more.

The majority of agencies who responded were aware of revision 2 to the 2009 MUTCD which lists the changes to compliance dates.

Just over half of the agencies responding have an assessment or management method in place and the majority of the remaining agencies responding will be able to meet the June 13, 2014 date for having an assessment or management method in place for regulatory and warning signs.

About one half of the agencies responding use or will be using "Visual Nighttime Inspection" for their primary assessment method. With the remainder of the agencies spread out among the remaining assessment and management methods.

## Survey Responses:

### 1 and 2) Agencies who responded to the 2012 survey:

Total Agencies: 42

**Cities: 29**

**Counties: 13**

Brier	Poulsbo	Chelan
Connell	Renton	Clark
Duvall	Roy	Grant
Everett	Sedro-Woolley	Grays Harbor
Federal Way	Tumwater	Island
Fife	Walla Walla	King

Kalama	Wenatchee	Kitsap
Kenmore	Anonymous City A	Lewis
Kent	Anonymous City B	Skagit
Latah	Anonymous City C	Spokane
Leavenworth	Anonymous City D	Thurston
Mount Vernon	Anonymous City E	Walla Walla
Mukilteo	Anonymous City F	Anonymous County A
Nooksack	Anonymous City G	
Port Angeles		

### 3) Population

- **1,500 or less.**  
4 agencies  
**4 cities:** Latah, Nooksack, Roy and anonymous city A.
- **1,501 – 5,000.**  
4 agencies  
**3 cities:** Kalama, Leavenworth and anonymous city E.  
**1 County:** Anonymous county A.
- **5,001 – 10,000.**  
6 agencies  
**6 cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Fife, Poulsbo and anonymous city F.
- **10,001 – 15,000.**  
2 agencies  
**2 cities:** Sedro-Woolley and anonymous city D.
- **15,001 – 25,000.**  
4 agencies  
**4 cities:** Kenmore, Mukilteo, Port Angeles and Tumwater.
- **25,001 – 50,000.**  
6 agencies  
**4 cities:** Mount Vernon, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous city B.  
**2 counties:** Chelan and Walla Walla.
- **50,001 – 85,000.**  
4 agencies  
**1 city:** Anonymous city C.  
**3 counties:** Grays Harbor, Island and Lewis counties.

- **85,001 or above.**  
12 agencies  
**5 cities:** Everett, Federal Way, Kent, Renton and anonymous city G.  
**7 counties:** Clark, Grant, King, Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane and Thurston counties.

**4) Before this survey, was your agency aware of the change in target compliance dates from revision 2 of the 2009 MUTCD?**

Yes: 41 agencies

- **28 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Everett, Federal Way, Fife, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Latah, Leavenworth, Mukilteo, Nooksack, Port Angeles, Poulsbo, Renton, Roy, Sedro – Woolley, Tumwater, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, B, C, D, E, F and G.
- **13 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

No: 0 agencies

I don't know: 1 agency

- **1 City:** Mount Vernon.

**5) Does your agency currently have an assessment or management method in place for maintaining traffic sign retroreflectivity?**

Yes: 25 agencies

- **13 Cities:** Brier, Federal Way, Kenmore, Kent, Mount Vernon, Nooksack, Port Angeles, Renton, Roy, Tumwater, Walla Walla and anonymous cities A and B.
- **12 Counties:** Chelan, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

No: 17 agencies

- **16 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Everett, Fife, Kalama, Latah, Leavenworth, Mukilteo, Poulsbo, Sedro-Woolley, Wenatchee and anonymous cities C, D, E, F and G.
- **1 County:** Clark.

I don't know: 0 agencies

**6) If the answer to #5 is no, will your agency be able to meet the June 13, 2014 deadline for having an assessment or management method in place for regulatory and warning signs?**

Yes: 16 agencies

- **14 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Everett, Federal Way, Fife, Kalama, Kent, Latah, Poulsbo, Roy, Sedro-Woolley and anonymous cities C, F and G.
- **2 Counties:** Clark and anonymous county A.

No: 2 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Mukilteo and anonymous city E.

I don't know: 4 agencies

- **4 Cities:** Kenmore, Leavenworth, Wenatchee and anonymous city D.

**7) If the answer to #6 is no, why not? Select all that apply.**

The need to purchase inspection equipment: 3 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Kenmore, Roy and anonymous city E.

The need to purchase sign management software: 3 agencies

- **3 cities:** Kenmore, Mukilteo and anonymous city E.

The need to hire one or more staff members: 3 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Kenmore and Mukilteo.
- **1 County:** Anonymous county A.

Become more familiar with the requirements: 2 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Kenmore and anonymous city E.

The need to attend formal training: 3 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Kenmore and anonymous city E.
- **1 County:** Anonymous county A.

The need to obtain funding: 2 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Kenmore and anonymous city E.

Other: 4 agencies

- **3 Cities:**
  - Mukilteo - We are working with a consultant to develop a simple software system for tracking signs but may also need to hire some temp. help, but have funding problems for this work.
  - Wenatchee - Need to complete a signing database. We had none until we started one in 2012.
  - Anonymous city C - We have our inventory in place and are in the process of creating our area of control signs.
- **1 County:**
  - Anonymous county A- We are in the process of upgrading nearly all of our signs to the new retro-reflectivity standard, which will require less effort for annual assessment.

## 8) What is your agency's primary assessment or management method?

Visual nighttime inspection: 21 agencies

- **11 Cities:** Connell, Everett, Federal Way, Fife, Kenmore, Mount Vernon, Renton, Sedro-Woolley, Walla Walla and anonymous cities A and B.
- **10 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Walla Walla, and anonymous county A.

Measured sign retroreflectivity: 2 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Mukilteo and Tumwater.

Expected sign life: 11 agencies

- **8 Cities:** Brier, Kenmore, Kent, Nooksack and anonymous cities C, D, E and G.
- **3 Counties:** Grant, Spokane and Thurston.

Blanket replacement: 2 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Port Angeles and Roy.

We don't know yet: 7 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Duvall, Kalama, Latah, Leavenworth, Poulsbo, Wenatchee and anonymous city F.

Other method: 3 agencies

- **1 City:**
  - Anonymous city C - We are planning to use control signs, expected life and measured retroreflectivity.
- **2 Counties:**
  - Grant - We also do some correlative testing. All new signs put into service are type 4 prismatic.
  - Thurston – Over time we will probably migrate to a control sign method too and/or use a combination of methods.

**9) If your agency has selected a supplementary, secondary method to combine with your primary method, what is that method? Please mark all that apply.**

Other method: 1 agency

- **1 County:** Skagit.

Visual nighttime inspection: 3 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Leavenworth, Port Angeles and anonymous city F.

Measured sign retroreflectivity: 6 agencies

- **4 Cities:** Mount Vernon, Renton, Sedro-Woolley and anonymous city F.
- **2 Counties:** Chelan and Grant.

Expected sign life: 5 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Fife and anonymous city F.
- **3 Counties:** Clark, Island and Walla Walla.

Blanket replacement: 12 agencies

- **9 Cities:** Brier, Kenmore, Kent, Nooksack, Roy and anonymous cities B, E, F and G.
- **3 Counties:** Chelan, Grant and anonymous county A.

Control signs: 4 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Kent, Leavenworth and anonymous city C.
- **1 County:** King.

**10) How many signs does your agency manage? Are you basing the number on a sign inventory or an estimate?**

Number of signs: 39 agencies

- **26 Cities:**
  - Connell 200
  - Duvall 1,200
  - Everett 33,000
  - Federal Way 8,000
  - Fife 2,150
  - Kalama 100
  - Kenmore 2,300
  - Kent 14,000
  - Latah 100
  - Leavenworth 400
  - Mount Vernon 5,054
  - Mukilteo 3,000
  - Port Angeles 4,000
  - Poulsbo 2,215
  - Renton 10,800
  - Roy 75
  - Sedro-Woolley 3,000
  - Tumwater 3,819
  - Walla Walla 6,500
  - Wenatchee 10,000
  - Anonymous city A 228
  - Anonymous city B 7,000
  - Anonymous city C 11,500
  - Anonymous city E 500
  - Anonymous city F 400
  - Anonymous city G 22,000



- **13 Counties:**  
Chelan 7,500  
Clark 100,000  
Grant 11,343  
Grays Harbor 8000  
Island 20,000  
King 44,000  
Kitsap 19,400  
Lewis 11,000  
Skagit 115,460  
Spokane 28,000  
Thurston 17,000  
Walla Walla 3,600  
Anonymous county A

Sign inventory: 39 agencies

- **11 Cities:** Fife, Kenmore, Mount Vernon, Mukilteo, Port Angeles, Poulsbo, Renton, Tumwater and anonymous cities A, B and C.
- **11 Counties:** Chelan, Grant, Grays Harbor, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

Estimate: 18 agencies

- **15 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Everett, Federal Way, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Latah, Leavenworth, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous cities E and F.
- **2 Counties:** Clark and Island.

**11) This question is for agencies that have started to change out signs to ones that meet the minimum retroreflectivity requirements. What percent of signs that need to be replaced have been replaced so far?**

21 agencies

- **12 Cities:**  
Brier 10%  
Duvall 5%  
Kenmore 10%  
Kent 10%

Mount Vernon 5%  
Nooksack 5%  
Port Angeles 10%  
Roy 40%  
Walla Walla 20%.

- **9 Counties:**

Chelan 70%  
Grant 85%  
Grays Harbor 70%  
Island 25%  
King 85%  
Spokane 10%  
Thurston 30 %  
Walla Walla 95%  
Anonymous county A

**12) What resources does your agency currently turn to for help or information on sign retroreflectivity? Select all answers that apply.**

Another city or county: 13 agencies

- **10 Cities:** Duvall, Federal Way, Kalama, Kenmore, Renton, Sedro-Woolley and anonymous cities C, D, E and G.
- **3 Counties:** Island, Kitsap and Thurston.

WSDOT Highways and Local Programs: 28 agencies

- **19 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Everett, Kalama, Kenmore, Latah, Mount Vernon, Nooksack, Renton, Sedro-Woolley, Tumwater, Wenatchee and anonymous cities B, C, D, E, F and G.
- **9 Counties:** Clark, Grant, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Thurston and anonymous county A.

A consultant with subject matter expertise: 4 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Leavenworth and anonymous cities E and F.
- **1 County:** Kitsap.

Your own agency's resources: 22 agencies

- **12 Cities:** Duvall, Everett, Fife, Kent, Mount Vernon, Mukilteo, Port Angeles, Poulsbo, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A and B.
- **10 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, King, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston and Walla Walla.

Other: 8 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Everett, Nooksack, Roy, Tumwater and anonymous city C.
- **3 Counties:** Chelan, Skagit and anonymous county A.

If you answered "Other" or wish to explain your above answer, please explain here:

7 agencies

- **4 Cities:**
  - Everett – vendors
  - Nooksack – on-line sources
  - Roy - grants any available funds
  - Tumwater – International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA).
- **3 Counties:**
  - Chelan - We applied for and received a grant for rural road safety improvements
  - Skagit – MUTCD
  - Anonymous county A - Internet research by our own agency personnel.

**13) If your agency's staff needs training, where do you plan to get this training? Select all answers that apply.**

Ask another local agency for assistance: 11 agencies

- **8 Cities:** Federal Way, Kalama, Latah, Renton, Sedro-Woolley and anonymous cities B, D and E.
- **3 Counties:** Chelan, King and Thurston.

Ask WSDOT for assistance: 14 agencies

- **9 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Everett, Kalama, Kenmore, Latah and anonymous cities C, D and E.
- **5 Counties:** Clark, Grays Harbor, Island, Kitsap and Thurston.

WSDOT Highways and Local Programs website: 23 agencies

- **17 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Kalama, Kent, Latah, Leavenworth, Nooksack, Port Angeles, Tumwater, Walla Walla and anonymous cities A, B, C, D, E and F.
- **6 Counties:** Clark, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Skagit and Thurston.

FHWA website: 11 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Kent, Renton, Walla Walla and anonymous cities B and C.
- **6 Counties:** Clark, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Skagit and Thurston.

Read printed information: 25 agencies

- **16 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Everett, Fife, Kalama, Kent, Latah, Mount Vernon, Mukilteo, Nooksack, Tumwater, Walla Walla and anonymous cities B, C and D.
- **9 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

Listened to a webinar: 14 agencies

- **9 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Fife, Poulsbo, Tumwater, Walla Walla and anonymous cities C, D and G.
- **5 Counties:** Chelan, Island, King, Lewis and Thurston.

Attended a WSDOT Highways and Local Programs class: 29 agencies

- **17 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Everett, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Mount Vernon, Renton, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Tumwater, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, C, E, F and G.
- **12 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston and anonymous county A.

Attend a class sponsored by another organization: 11 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Kalama, Kenmore, Leavenworth, Poulsbo and Tumwater.
- **6 Counties:** Chelan, Grays Harbor, Kitsap, Lewis, Thurston and Walla Walla.

Other: 2 agencies

- **2 Counties:** Grays Harbor and Kitsap.

If you answered "Other" or wish to explain your above answer, please explain here:

2 agencies

- **2 Counties:**  
Grays Harbor - FHWA sponsored workshop.  
Kitsap - Zumar and 3M rep. presentations.

**14) Did your agency attend the 2-hour Traffic Sign Retroreflectivity Measurement and Management class in November 2011? The class was sponsored by WSDOT Highways and Local Programs. The topics were: Provide background information on retroreflectivity, the MUTCD's minimum sign retroreflectivity requirements, the six inspection methods that can be used to evaluate sign retroreflectivity, and resources for technical and funding assistance.**

Yes: 24 agencies

- **15 Cities:** Brier, Everett, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Mount Vernon, Mukilteo, Port Angeles, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, C and G.
- **9 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis and Thurston.

No: 15 agencies

- **13 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Federal Way, Fife, Leavenworth, Nooksack, Poulsbo, Renton, Tumwater and anonymous cities B, D, E and F.
- **2 Counties:** Skagit and Walla Walla.

I don't know: 4 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Kenmore and Latah.
- **2 Counties:** Spokane and anonymous county A.

**15) Is your agency interested in attending our next class? The topics are: Provide background information on retroreflectivity, the MUTCD's minimum sign retroreflectivity requirements, the six inspection methods that can be used to evaluate sign retroreflectivity, economic analysis, and resources for technical and funding assistance.**

Yes: 31 agencies

- **23 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Duvall, Everett, Fife, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Latah, Leavenworth, Mukilteo, Poulsbo, Renton, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Walla Walla, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, B, C, D, F and G.
- **8 Counties:** Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Lewis, Spokane and Walla Walla.

No: 6 agencies

- **4 Cities:** Federal Way, Mount Vernon, Port Angeles and Tumwater.
- **2 Counties:** Chelan and Thurston.

I don't know: 5 agencies

- **2 Cities:** Nooksack and anonymous city E.
- **3 Counties:** Kitsap, Skagit and anonymous county A.

## **16) How can Highways and Local Programs and FHWA improve its training on traffic sign retroreflectivity?**

16 agencies

- **12 Cities:**
  - Duvall - Have additional classes.
  - Everett - I think that understanding how WSDOT will approach its plan will help. We understand there are control signs around the state that are currently being measured, and would like to hear the result of those studies.
  - Fife - More on-line resources.
  - Kalama - Hold classes tied into conferences or workshops.
  - Kenmore - I feel that the class needs to be a two day or at least a full day class that focuses on what can or will happen if the agency isn't in compliance. Hands on training with some of the ways to measure retroreflectivity would be helpful.
  - Mukilteo - Offer a webinar.
  - Renton - The class could be in more of a central location or maybe a downloadable video.
  - Roy - Help people understand what needs to be done and why.
  - Wenatchee - Leave FHWA in their offices. Highways and Local Programs staff can do a fantastic job on their own.
  - Anonymous city B - Update current changes.
  - Anonymous city C - Have some sample, hands-on training of available software programs agencies are using.
  - Anonymous city E - Provide local training.
- **4 Counties:**
  - Grant - Continue to provide access to a minimum level of training.

- Island - Make sure instructors have the latest information. Provide real-world examples from numerous local agencies about how they manage their sign inventory.
- Lewis - Continue to provide both written literature and affordable web-based or live training.
- Anonymous county A - Provide clear and concise guidelines for street name signs and how to specify them to meet the criteria. Explain how we will need to respond with a mix of mostly new, but some old signs in our assessment practices.

**17) On what traffic sign retroreflectivity topic(s) would your agency like training?**

9 agencies

- **5 Cities:**

- Duvall – All.
- Everett - A synopsis of how other agencies are going to address the requirements would be helpful.
- Kalama - Life expectancy for signs and inspection practices.
- Wenatchee - Inexpensive visual methods of inspection that meet the minimum requirements of the MUTCD.
- Anonymous city B - Upcoming proposed changes.
- Anonymous city C - Downloading retroreflectometer data into an existing sign inventory database.
- Anonymous city F – All.

- **4 Counties:**

- Island - Some additional information on documentation and record-keeping would be useful. Also, information about different sheeting types and expected life of each.
- Lewis - More training on measured retroreflectivity, how to use the equipment, and how to obtain it through grants, rentals, etc.
- Thurston - I think night inspection training in late September of every year would be nice to send staff to and it would provide a consistent/defensible education/training process for those agencies using it as a primary, secondary, or supplemental means of managing their sign inventory.
- Anonymous county A - Assessment timing and methodology for new sign installations. Review of nighttime assessment method along with sample forms and tips for success.

**18) If your agency's staff has received training, where did you get this training? Select all answers that apply.**

Asked another local agency for assistance: 2 agencies

- **2 Counties:** Island and King.

Asked WSDOT for assistance: 2 agencies

- **1 City:** Connell.
- **1 County:** Kitsap.

WSDOT Highways and Local Programs website: 8 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Connell, Kenmore, Kent, Walla Walla and anonymous city C.
- **3 Counties:** Island, King and Skagit.

FHWA website: 7 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Kent, Walla Walla and anonymous city C.
- **4 Counties:** Island, King, Skagit and Thurston.

Read printed information: 13 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Connell, Fife, Kent, Mount Vernon, Nooksack, Walla Walla and anonymous city C.
- **6 Counties:** Chelan, Grant, Island, King, Skagit and Walla Walla.

Listened to a webinar: 13 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Connell, Fife, Poulsbo, Sedro-Woolley, Tumwater and anonymous cities C and G.
- **6 Counties:** Chelan, Grant, Island, King, Lewis and Thurston.

Attended a WSDOT Highways and Local Programs class: 20 agencies

- **13 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Everett, Kalama, Kent, Mount Vernon, Port Angeles, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, C and G.
- **7 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Island, King, Lewis and Thurston.



Attended a class sponsored by another organization: 5 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Poulsbo, Tumwater and anonymous city G.
- **2 Counties:** Lewis and Walla Walla.

Other: 4 agencies

- **3 Cities:** Mukilteo, Renton and Tumwater.
- **1 County:** Kitsap.

If you answered "Other" or wish to explain your above answer, please explain here:

4 agencies

- **3 Cities:**
  - Mukilteo - Don't think we have had any other training.
  - Renton - FHWA class in 2010. Our supervisors were the only attendees. Very good class that I would like my crews to attend.
  - Tumwater – International Municipal Signal Association (IMSA).
- **1 County:**
  - Kitsap - Sign supplier representatives.

**19) What funding source does your agency use or what sources will your agency pursue to meet the new requirements? Select all answers that apply.**

No new funding sources: 18 agencies

- **14 Cities:** Federal Way, Fife, Kalama, Kent, Mount Vernon, Mukilteo, Port Angeles, Renton, Sedro-Woolley, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, B, D and E.
- **4 Counties:** Grant, Grays Harbor, Kitsap and anonymous county A.

County road funds or city street use funds: 21 agencies

- **9 Cities:** Brier, Connell, Kalama, Kenmore, Walla Walla and anonymous cities D, E, F and G.
- **12 Counties:** Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

Absorbing the cost within your current budget: 28 agencies

- **16 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Kalama, Kenmore, Kent, Mount Vernon, Nooksack, Poulsbo, Roy, Sedro-Woolley, Wenatchee and anonymous cities A, B, C, D and E.
- **12 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Grant, Grays Harbor, Island, King, Kitsap, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston, Walla Walla and anonymous county A.

Have asked for a budget increase: 6 agencies

- **5 Cities:** Everett, Kent, Tumwater, Walla Walla and anonymous city E.
- **1 County:** King.

Special appropriations from council: 2 agencies

- **1 City:** Duvall.
- **1 County:** King.

Grants: 15 agencies

- **7 Cities:** Connell, Duvall, Leavenworth, Roy and anonymous cities E, F and G.
- **8 Counties:** Chelan, Clark, Island, Lewis, Skagit, Spokane, Thurston and anonymous county A.

This has not yet been determined: 6 agencies

- **6 Cities:** Duvall, Kalama, Latah, Mukilteo, Nooksack and anonymous city C.

Other: 1 agency

- **1 County:** Anonymous A.

Please explain and provide more detail for your answer: 10 agencies

- **6 Cities:**
  - Brier – Work within our yearly budget.
  - Everett - Increases in the budget for sign maintenance will be requested in subsequent budget cycles. With the change in compliance dates, the increase in the budget has been deferred until the plan is developed and a more accurate need can be assessed.
  - Tumwater - Because we are only collecting the data and have not started replacing low performing signs yet we are estimating that we will need \$10,000 per year to maintain our signs. This number will need to be adjusted as the program evolves.

- Anonymous city B - We currently replace dead, knocked down with new hi-vis prismatic sheeting.
- Anonymous city C - The initial project to complete the sign inventory database was created as a project out of the last budget cycle. The measuring and future replacements costs are yet to be given a funding source.
- Anonymous city E – We don't currently have the money to replace signs for this requirement so we would be interested in any grants that might be available.
- **4 Counties:**
  - Skagit - We currently have a program in place for visual nighttime assessment. We have also received a FHWA Safety Grant to upgrade our signs to High Intensity sheeting.
  - Thurston - Over the years we have used several Federal HSIP and HRRRP monies to update signing across the roadway network. Also signs are updated as part of capital improvement projects which contain a variety of funding sources.
  - Walla Walla – We have a sign budget.
  - Anonymous county A - We are using grants to install new signs that meet the higher standard. After that, we will need to use scarce local road funds to do the assessment unless other funds become available.

## 20) What comments or questions do you have?

Comments or questions: 6 agencies

- **4 Cities:**
  - Federal Way - By the comment letters in the latest request for comments on the compliance dates in the current MUTCD (as well as those generated in the adoption of the 2009 edition), it is apparent that FHWA has been increasingly out of touch with the struggles of state and local agencies in optimizing roadway safety in an era of declining budgets, increasing mandates, and a voter base that is prone to say “no” to any revenue increases. FHWA wants to play the lead part in “Father Knows Best” in mandating upgrades to traffic control devices, but the analogy doesn’t work because FHWA doesn’t understand the budgetary or liability consequences of the mandates. A more realistic analogy is that FHWA is a spoiled teenage drama queen, demanding the latest in gadgets and clothes for superficial enhancements, in complete ignorance of their cost relative to the household income. The problem is now compounded in that Father was laid off from his middle-income job and is now desperately trying to make ends meet by working part-time at Wal-Mart. Hence, the collective cry from state and local agencies, “Are you nuts? We can’t

afford that!” When couched in these terms, the solution is obvious: the teenager should not be in a position to make these decisions. Therefore, the roles of FHWA and the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices need to be reversed. The NCUTCD needs to be the decision-maker and FHWA needs to be support staff to the Committee. The Committee has a much firmer grasp of the financial and liability consequences of setting compliance dates, and determining what should be standard, guidance, and option statements than FHWA has demonstrated.

- Kalama - A class helping small municipalities build a program would be nice. It seems the small cities are the ones with less people to maintain such a program.
- Anonymous city A - Small cities with no means of doing the upgrades should be exempted from this requirement.
- Anonymous city C - We would like more specific info. on grant money available to complete the measurement and replacements of signs.
- **2 Counties:**
  - Thurston - I would like WSDOT in cooperation with local agencies to develop expected sign life measurements or control sign program for the westside and eastside of the state that we all can use for a sign management program. This would allow for a consistent and defensible application across the state for all agencies if agencies elected to use this method.
  - Anonymous county A - Thanks for the information and your efforts to keep us informed of these requirements.

**Thank you to those who participated in this survey.**